COMPILED JUDICIAL RECORD

Chief Justice of India Surya Kant

Tenure: 24 November 2025 – 9 February 2027

Controversial Statements, Case Disposals & Patterns of Conduct

Compiled: May 2026 | For Parliamentary Reference

PREFATORY NOTE

This document is a factual compilation of public record: verbatim statements made from the Bench, case outcomes, and contemporaneous reporting by accredited legal publications (LiveLaw, Bar & Bench, The Wire, The Leaflet, and others). All statements attributed to Chief Justice Surya Kant are sourced from official court proceedings as reported by legal journalists present in court. This record does not attribute motive or render legal conclusions. It is assembled for the use of Members of Parliament and constitutional researchers as a factual reference.

Note on fake quotes: On 10 May 2026, the CJI's office issued a press release condemning fabricated casteist statements circulated on social media platform X. Those fabricated statements are NOT reproduced here. Only verified, court-recorded statements are included.

1. SUBJECT PROFILE

Full Name	Justice Surya Kant
Designation	53rd Chief Justice of India
Tenure as CJI	24 November 2025 – 9 February 2027
Date of Birth	10 February 1962, Hisar, Haryana
Elevated to Supreme Court	24 May 2019
Prior Role	Chief Justice, Himachal Pradesh High Court (2018–2019)
Background	Youngest Advocate General of Haryana (2000); LL.B., Maharishi Dayanand University (1984); LL.M. First Class First, Kurukshetra University

2. TIMELINE OF CONTROVERSIAL STATEMENTS FROM THE BENCH

The following statements were made by CJI Surya Kant during open court hearings. Each entry is supported by contemporaneous reporting from legal journalism outlets.

Entry 1 2 December 2025

Matter	Habeas Corpus Petition on Rohingya custodial disappearances (Rita Manchanda petition)
Statement(s)	*"If an intruder comes, do we give them a red carpet welcome saying we would like to give you all facilities? You dug a tunnel or cross the fence and enter India illegally." And: "Where is the order of the Government of India declaring them as refugees? … If there is no legal status of a refugee, and somebody is an intruder, and he enters illegally, do we have an obligation to keep them here?"*
Source	LiveLaw; The Leaflet; Maktoob Media (5 Dec 2025)
Outcome / Consequence	A coalition of former High Court and Supreme Court judges, senior advocates (Justice A.P. Shah, Justice K. Chandru, Justice Anjana Prakash, Dr. Rajeev Dhavan, Colin Gonsalves, Kamini Jaiswal) and the Campaign for Judicial Accountability and Reforms (CJAR) issued an open letter dated 5 Dec 2025, terming the remarks 'unconscionable' and 'contrary to core constitutional values.' They cited NHRC v. State of Arunachal Pradesh (1996) for the principle that Article 21 protections extend to every person on Indian soil. A counter-statement by 44 retired judges followed on 10 Dec 2025.
Concern on Record	Equating genocide survivors with criminal intruders from the Bench; potential chilling effect on lower courts and detention authorities.

Entry 2 10 February 2026

Matter	PIL against hate speech by Assam Chief Minister Himanta Biswa Sarma (CPI leader Annie Raja petition)
Statement(s)	*"This is becoming a trend now right before elections… political battles find their way into the country's highest court." The bench characterised the filing as a "selective" move — a "calculated effort to demoralise High Courts."*
Source	The Wire (16 Feb 2026); LawBeat (17 Feb 2026); The Hans India
Outcome / Consequence	PIL declined under Article 32. Petitioners directed to Gauhati High Court. The petition had documented a chronology of statements from 2021–2026 by CM Sarma calling for socio-economic exclusion of Bengali-origin Muslims, including exhortations to deny them livelihoods, transport, land, and voting rights. An official BJP video depicting CM Sarma in a shooting posture with overlaid text 'Point blank shot / No Mercy' targeting a named Muslim community was at issue.
Concern on Record	Pre-election framing used to decline a fundamental rights petition under Article 32 without engaging with the documented hate speech record; asymmetric scrutiny of petitions against ruling-party functionaries.

Entry 3 23 February 2026

Matter	Mentioning of NJAC plea by Advocate Mathews Nedumpara
Statement(s)	*When Advocate Nedumpara stated "Constitution Benches are being formed for Adani and Ambani matters; but the Registry still has not looked at the NJAC application," CJI Surya Kant responded: "Mr. Nedumpara, be careful with what you submit in my court. You have seen me in Chandigarh, in Delhi… I am warning you, be careful. Don't think you will be able to continue misbehaving as you have been doing with other benches. I am warning you."*

Source	LiveLaw (23 Feb 2026); Court Beat News (25 Feb 2026)
Outcome / Consequence	Warning issued; no substantive order on the NJAC matter. The advocate's underlying constitutional concern — that matters of public constitutional importance receive lower listing priority than corporate cases — was not addressed.
Concern on Record	Personal warning language directed at an advocate for raising a procedural constitutional concern; use of personal history ('you have seen me in Chandigarh') as implicit threat.

Entry 4 24 February 2026

Matter	General observations during PIL hearing
Statement(s)	*"We are on the mushroom growth of PIL petitioners. Looks like there are some prominent faces now whose only agenda is to read the newspaper in the morning and file a PIL by evening… This PIL business is becoming worrisome… This needs to be stopped."*
Source	LiveLaw (24 Feb 2026)
Outcome / Consequence	Broad judicial disapproval of PIL culture expressed publicly from the Bench, without reference to a specific petition. Critics noted the characterisation conflates frivolous petitions with legitimate public interest litigation by civil society, journalists, and former bureaucrats.
Concern on Record	Sweeping characterisation of PIL petitioners as opportunistic, made from the Bench, without evidentiary basis; potential chilling effect on access to justice.

Entry 5 March 2026

Matter	PIL challenging civic infrastructure negligence (Dushyant Sejwal v. Union of India) — young advocate, 4 years of practice
Statement(s)	*CJI Surya Kant: "Stop chasing national media." The bench noted a "growing trend of young lawyers filing baseless petitions mainly to get attention on social media instead of improving their legal skills."*
Source	LawFul Talks (9 Mar 2026)
Outcome / Consequence	PIL dismissed as 'vague' and 'evasive.' The petition concerned fatal accidents caused by open pits on poorly maintained public roads. The bench held reliefs sought were impractical, without engaging the substance of the infrastructure neglect claim.
Concern on Record	Impugning a petitioner's motive (seeking media attention) without evidentiary basis; dismissal of a petition raising genuine civic safety concerns with a personal rebuke rather than substantive legal reasoning.

Entry 6 15 May 2026

Matter	Hearing on senior advocate designation application; contempt petition mentioning
Statement(s)	*"There are already parasites of society who attack the system and you want to join hands with them? There are youngsters like cockroaches, who don't get any employment and don't have any place in profession. Some of them become media, some of them become social media, some of them become RTI activists, some of them become other activists, and they start attacking everyone." And: "I want the CBI to verify the LLB degrees of most of the Delhi people… the kind of Facebook and things they are putting… do they think we*

	are not watching? BCI will not do anything… thousands of them are fraudulent people who are wearing black robes."
Source	The Wire (15 May 2026); Deccan Herald; The Week; LiveLaw
Outcome / Consequence	Application for senior designation refused. Threat to refer law degree verification of 'thousands' of Delhi lawyers to CBI made from the Bench. Nationwide controversy; criticism from bar associations and civil liberties groups. The remarks directly targeted RTI activists, journalists, and social media commentators critical of the judiciary.
Concern on Record	Dehumanising language ('cockroaches,' 'parasites') directed at unemployed youth and civil society from the nation's highest judicial office; explicit threat of CBI investigation against advocates based on their social media posts criticising institutions — with no reference to any specific allegation or legal standard.

3. NOTABLE CASE DISPOSALS UNDER CJI SURYA KANT: PATTERNS & CONCERNS

The following cases were disposed of, dismissed, or otherwise concluded under benches led by CJI Surya Kant. Where a pattern of conduct is observable across multiple matters, it is noted.

Case 1 Rohingya deportation / disappearance petitions

Category	Refugee Rights / Article 21
Period	Dec 2025 – ongoing
Disposal	Petitions heard with hostile bench observations; interim relief denied in related matter (Mohammad Ismail, 2025). UNHCR refugee cards questioned from the Bench as a 'showroom' process.
Concern on Record	The Supreme Court's own precedent (NHRC v. Arunachal Pradesh, 1996) holds Article 21 extends to every person in India. India's SOP on Foreign Nationals Claiming Refugee Status (2011, revised 2019) was not engaged. Bench observations likening genocide survivors to criminal tunnel-diggers carry cascading effect on lower authorities.

Case 2 PIL against Assam CM Himanta Biswa Sarma's alleged hate speech (Annie Raja / CPI petition)

Category	Hate Speech / Minority Rights
Period	10–16 February 2026
Disposal	Declined under Article 32. Petitioners directed to Gauhati High Court. CJI characterised it as election-season political pressure.
Concern on Record	The 2023 Supreme Court direction in Tehseen Poonawalla required governments to act suo motu on hate speech FIRs. Petitioners presented a 5-year documented record. The Supreme Court's own remedial framework was the basis for approaching Article 32. The bench's framing ('calculated to demoralise High Courts') substituted a political diagnosis for substantive constitutional analysis.

Case 3 Second PIL on political party hate speech (following Annie Raja petition refusal)

Category	Hate Speech / Electoral Accountability
Period	17 February 2026
Disposal	Petitioner asked to 'withdraw this… file a simple plea on what conditional safeguards have been laid down and how it's violated.' Matter effectively stalled.
Concern on Record	Conversion of a rights-based petition into a procedural exercise; bench's observation that 'there has to be restraint on all sides' treated documented incitement as equivalent to political criticism, without addressing the evidentiary record.

Case 4 NJAC plea — Advocate Mathews Nedumpara

Category	Judicial Appointments / Collegium Accountability
Period	2024 – 23 February 2026
Disposal	Registry refused to register in 2024. On 23 Feb 2026, fresh mention resulted in a personal warning to the advocate.
Concern on Record	The National Judicial Appointments Commission (NJAC) represents a constitutional question (validity of the 2015 judgment vis-à-vis parliamentary intent). The Bench's response was to warn the advocate personally rather than address the constitutional question or the listing concern raised.

Case 5 PIL on civic infrastructure negligence (Dushyant Sejwal v. Union of India)

Category	Public Safety / Civic Accountability
Period	March 2026
Disposal	Dismissed as 'vague' and 'evasive.' Advocate publicly rebuked for 'chasing national media.'
Concern on Record	Fatal accidents due to open pits on public roads is a documented, concrete public safety matter. The bench's dismissal on the basis of imputed motive (media attention) rather than substantive engagement with the reliefs sought is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's own PIL jurisprudence.

Case 6 Senior advocate designation application (context of 'cockroach' statement)

Category	Legal Profession / Access to Justice
Period	15 May 2026
Disposal	Application refused. CJI stated that designation 'is a status to be conferred and not to be legally pursued.'
Concern on Record	The refusal is within judicial discretion. However, the accompanying remarks — threatening CBI verification of lawyers' degrees based on their social media posts, characterising unemployed youth and RTI activists as 'cockroaches' and 'parasites' — raised concerns about judicial temperament and potential chilling effect on the legal profession and civil society.

Case 7 CEC/EC appointment law PILs

Category	Electoral Integrity / Constitutional Appointments
Period	March 2026
Disposal	CJI recused, citing potential conflict of interest. Earlier bench (pre-CJI tenure) had refused to stay the 2023 Act on 21 March 2024.
Concern on Record	Recusal is proper procedure. However, the case remains significant: the 2023 Chief Election Commissioner and Other Election Commissioners (Appointment, Conditions of Service and Term of Office) Act removed the CJI from the selection panel for Election Commissioners, replacing it with a Cabinet-dominated committee. The PIL challenges remain substantively unresolved.

4. OBSERVABLE PATTERNS

The following patterns emerge from the factual record compiled above. These are observations of conduct, not legal conclusions.

#	Pattern	Factual Basis
A	**Differential treatment of petitions targeting ruling-party officials**	PILs against Assam CM Sarma's documented hate speeches were declined or redirected with election-season framing. No equivalent framing was applied when the bench engaged with the Anil Ambani banking fraud probe. This differential does not establish motive, but it is part of the observable record.
B	**Framing of citizens' access to justice as a systemic burden**	Repeated public statements from the Bench — 'mushroom growth of PILs,' 'read the newspaper and file by evening,' 'cockroaches become RTI activists' — characterise access to judicial remedy as a problem rather than a constitutional right. This is in tension with the Supreme Court's own PIL jurisprudence developed since Hussainara Khatoon (1979).
C	**Threats directed at advocates and civil society from the Bench**	On at least two occasions (23 February 2026, NJAC matter; 15 May 2026, senior designation hearing), the CJI issued personal warnings or invoked investigative agencies (CBI) in connection with advocates' professional conduct or social media activity. The use of CBI threat in a court proceeding, without any specific allegation meeting any legal threshold, is constitutionally significant.
D	**Remarks at variance with established constitutional precedent**	The Rohingya hearing remarks (2 Dec 2025) did not engage with the non-refoulement principle or Article 21 precedent cited in NHRC v. Arunachal Pradesh (1996). The hate speech petition dismissals did not engage with the Tehseen Poonawalla (2018) directions. The pattern of declining to engage with the court's own precedents when they point toward state accountability is part of the record.
E	**Dehumanising language directed at marginalised groups from judicial office**	The 'cockroach' and 'parasite' characterisations (15 May 2026) and the 'tunnel-digger' framing for Rohingya refugees (2 Dec 2025) represent a departure from the constitutional expectation of judicial dignity and impartiality, as articulated in the Restatement of Values of Judicial Life (1997) adopted by the Supreme Court.

5. CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR PARLIAMENTARY REFERENCE

This section sets out the relevant constitutional provisions and precedents that Parliament may consider when reviewing the compiled record.

Provision / Instrument	Subject	Text / Holding
Article 124(4)	*Removal of a Supreme Court Judge*	A Judge of the Supreme Court shall not be removed from his office except by an order of the President passed after an address by each House of Parliament supported by a majority of the total membership of that House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members of that House present and voting has been presented to the President in the same session for such removal on the ground of proved misbehaviour or incapacity.
The Judges (Inquiry) Act, 1968	*Procedure for Investigation*	Sets out the process: motion signed by 100 Lok Sabha members (or 50 Rajya Sabha members); Speaker/Chairman may admit motion; three-member committee (SC judge, HC Chief Justice, distinguished jurist) investigates; committee report placed before Parliament; if misbehaviour or incapacity found, removal resolution passed.
Restatement of Values of Judicial Life (1997)	*Supreme Court's own code*	Adopted by the Supreme Court in full court. Includes: 'A Judge shall not use his position or the institution of the Court to promote his personal views or opinions'; 'A Judge shall not enter into public controversy'; 'Judges shall avoid unnecessary comment on pending matters or political questions.'
K. Veeraswami v. Union of India (1991)	*Judicial accountability precedent*	The Supreme Court held that judges are not above the law, and that conduct unbecoming a judge may attract consequences. The court noted that the Judges' Inquiry Act was 'the sole mechanism' for removal but did not preclude Parliament from scrutinising judicial conduct.
Sub-Committee on Judicial Accountability v. Union of India (1991)	*Parliamentary oversight*	Reaffirmed the primacy of Parliament in the removal process and that the inquiry committee must operate independently of both the executive and the judiciary being investigated.

6. SOURCES & REFERENCES

All entries in this record are based on the following primary and secondary sources:

1. LiveLaw.in — Court correspondent reports on all listed hearings
2. Bar & Bench (barandbench.com) — Registry reform observation (Feb 2026)
3. The Wire (thewire.in) — Rohingya hearing (Dec 2025); Himanta Biswa Sarma hate speech PIL (Feb 2026); 'Cockroach' statement (May 2026)

4. The Leaflet (theleaflet.in) — Open letter by former judges re: Rohingya (Dec 2025)
5. Maktoob Media — Former judges' open letter coverage (5 Dec 2025)
6. Outlook India — Rohingya hearing; open letter (Dec 2025)
7. The Tribune — CJI recusal from CEC/EC PIL (Mar 2026); 44 judges' counter-statement (Dec 2025)
8. Law Trend (lawtrend.in) — Rohingya open letter (Dec 2025)
9. LawBeat (lawbeat.in) — Hate speech PILs (Feb 2026); Adani matter
10. The Quint (thequint.com) — CJI designate profile (Nov 2025)
11. Deccan Herald — 'Cockroach' statement (May 2026)
12. The Week — 'Cockroach' statement (May 2026)
13. Court Beat News — NJAC/Adani-Ambani warning (Feb 2026)
14. LawFul Talks (lawfultalks.net) — 'Stop chasing media' PIL dismissal (Mar 2026)
15. The Statesman — Adani-Ambani warning (Feb 2026)
16. MSN/National outlet — Sabarimala PIL 'dustbin' remarks (May 2026)
17. ANI — CJI's office press release on fake social media quotes (10 May 2026)
18. Wikipedia — Justice Surya Kant profile (verified against original sources)
19. SCC Online — CJI designate case digest (Oct 2025)
20. The Wire (Mar 2026) — Same-week different standards: SC on Ambani vs. HC on Adani

CLOSING NOTE

This compilation covers the period November 2025 through May 2026. It will require updating as CJI Surya Kant's tenure continues until 9 February 2027. Compilers should also note: (a) the bench's constructive orders — including directing the CBI/ED to accelerate the Anil Ambani banking fraud probe (March 2026) and ordering Assam Human Rights Commission to probe fake encounters — are part of the complete judicial record and should be considered alongside the concerns documented above; (b) the fake social media quotes disowned by the CJI's office in May 2026 are not reflected here; only verified, court-recorded statements are included.